

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/577,009  
Attorney Docket No. 10191/4639  
Reply to Office Action of November 27, 2007

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Complying with the Office Action, five Replacement Sheets for the drawings are attached herein.

No new matter has been added, and the Replacement Sheets are supported by the present application, including the specification as explained herein. Entry and approval is respectfully requested.

Attachments: 5 Replacement Sheets.

**REMARKS**

Claims 19 to 36 are now pending.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested based on the following.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgement of foreign priority for claims 19 to 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 119.

Complying with the Office Action, five Replacement Sheets for the drawings are attached herein.

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with Examiner's objections to the "UE" labels contained in Figures 1 and 2, to facilitate the matter, Applicants have amended Figures 1 and 2 without prejudice by replacing the label "UE" with the label "Switch Device (UE)" for a clear representation of the block.

Applicants respectfully disagree with Office Action's objections to Figures 3 and 4 for asserted lack of descriptions in the processing blocks therein. Each processing block in Figures 3 and 4 has been clearly labeled with its function correspondingly described in the Substitute Specification. Therefore, Applicants cannot understand the Examiner's objections to Figures 3 and 4. However, to facilitate the matter, Applicants have amended Figures 3 and 4 without prejudice by adding descriptive letters to each processing block therein.

Applicants respectfully disagree with Examiner's objection to Figure 5 for lack of meaningful legends. Figure 5 provides indicative labels, e.g., Z1 to Z19, B1 to B5, and K1 to K4 etc., which have been correspondingly described in the Substitute Specification (*see* Substitute Specification, page 9, line 13 to page 11, line 8), -- therefore, they are helpful to understand the drawing contained in Figure 5. Accordingly, applicants cannot understand Examiner's objection to Figure 5 without further clarification with regard to the objections to legends in Figure 5. Therefore, withdrawal of the objection to Figure 5 is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added, and the Replacement Sheets are supported by the present application, including the specification. Entry and approval is respectfully requested.

Claims 19 to 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Grochowski et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,615,366 (the "Grochowski" reference).

To reject a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Office must demonstrate that each and every claim feature is identically described or contained in a single prior art reference. (See Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc., 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991)). As explained herein, it is respectfully submitted that the prior Office Action does not meet this standard, for example, as to all of the features of the claims.

Claim 19 relates to a method for switching between at least two operating modes of a processor unit and includes the feature of *assigning at least one identifier to at least the programs* and *switching between the operating modes as a function of the identifier* such that the processor unit runs the program according to the assigned operating mode.

It is respectfully submitted that the “Grochowski” reference does not identically disclose (or suggest) the features of *assigning at least one identifier to at least the programs*, the identifier allowing a differentiation between the at least two operating modes, and *switching between the operating modes as a function of the identifier* such that the processor unit runs the program according to the assigned operating mode, as provided for in the context of the claimed subject matter. The cited column 9, lines 61 to 65 of the “Grochowski” reference concerns a mode switch instruction prepended to a new High Performance (“HP”) or High Reliability (“HR”) process thread may be predicated on or off according to the value of Processor Status Bit (“PSB”) for the currently executing process thread. (*See* Office Action, page 3, lines 10 to 13). However, the PSB is merely an indicator of the execution mode of the processor, through which the execution mode may be tracked. (*See* the “Grochowski” reference, column 4, lines 53 to 56). The switching between the operating modes in the “Grochowski” reference is not a function of the PSB. Instead, the “Grochowski” reference makes it plain that the PSB is determined as a function of Core Status Bits (“CSB”), (*See Id.*, column 7, line 58), which are adjusted when a mode switch instruction triggers a switch between modes. (*See Id.*, column 4, lines 59 to 62). Clearly, the PSB is a result and indicator of switching mode, and the switch mode does not change as a function of the PCB.

Therefore, the “Grochowski” reference does not identically disclose (or suggest) the feature of *assigning at least one identifier to at least the programs* and *switching between the operating modes as a function of the identifier*, as provided for in the context of the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, claim 19 is not anticipated by the “Grochowski” reference.

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/577,009  
Attorney Docket No. 10191/4639  
Reply to Office Action of November 27, 2007

Accordingly, for at these reasons, claim 19 is allowable, as are its dependent claims 19 to 33.

Claims 34 and 36 include features similar to those of claim 19 and are therefore allowable for essentially the same reasons as claim 19.

Claim 35 depends from claim 34, and is therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 34.

In summary, all pending claims 19 to 36 are allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, all pending claims 19 to 36 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objection and rejections be withdrawn. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: 1/11/2008

By:

Gerard A. Messina  
(Reg. No. 35,952)

One Broadway  
New York, NY 10004  
(212) 425-7200

The image shows two handwritten signatures. The first signature is "Gerard A. Messina" followed by "35,952". The second signature is "Aaron C. Roach" followed by "33,765". To the left of these signatures, the date "1/11/2008" is written vertically.

**CUSTOMER NO. 26646**

1459796v1